

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,036,091 to Nguyen ("*Nguyen*") in view of U.S. Patent No 6,819,344 to Robbins ("*Robbins*").

By this amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 3, 5, and 7. Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-10 remain pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Nguyen* in view of *Robbins*. The Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness because *Nguyen* and *Robbins* do not teach or suggest all features of the claims.

Independent claim 1 recites "[a] method for displaying an electronic equipment input state on a menu screen" including "highlighting an icon corresponding to an operation," "selecting the highlighted icon," and "automatically centering the selected icon on the picture screen and removing the remaining plurality of icons on the first ring from the picture screen." *Nguyen* and *Robbins* fail to disclose the claimed "automatically centering."

Nguyen discloses that "in response to an option 424 being selected from the first menu 420, a second curvilinear menu 520 may be displayed in the GUI" (*Nguyen*, col. 8, lines 62-63). However, this does not constitute "automatically centering the selected icon on the picture screen and removing the remaining plurality of icons on the first ring from the picture screen," as required by claim 1. Instead, "the second menu 520 is concentrically disposed within the first menu 420" or "concentrically disposed around the first menu 420" (*Nguyen*, col. 8, lines 62-65, emphasis added). Therefore, *Nguyen* fails to disclose the claimed "automatically centering."

Robbins fails to cure the deficiencies of *Nguyen*. *Robbins* fails to disclose “automatically centering the selected icon on the picture screen and removing the remaining plurality of icons on the first ring from the picture screen,” as recited by claim 1. *Robbins* is generally directed to “facilitat[ing] visualization of multi-dimensional data. . .[where] [t]he data is selectively mapped into a three dimensional helical path” (*Robbins*, col. 4, lines 19-21). Furthermore, “[a]n associated user interface may be provided for selecting a segment of interest and, in turn, visualizing one or more other dimensions of data associated with the selected segment” (*Robbins*, col. 4, lines 23-26). More specifically, “[a] wheel 326 is associated with a particular portion of a segment 328 along the helical path 320 to visualize one or more other dimensions of data associated with the selected segment” (*Robbins*, col. 9, lines 46-49).

Robbins’s selecting a segment of interest does not teach or suggest “automatically centering the selected icon on the picture screen and removing the remaining plurality of icons on the first ring from the picture screen,” as recited by claim 1 (emphasis added). Instead, as shown in Figure 12 of *Robbins*, the selected segment is not necessarily “centered” upon selection (c.f. *Robbins*, Figure 10), nor is *Robbins* “removing” the remaining segments of the helical path. Therefore, *Robbins*, fails to disclose the claimed “automatically centering.”

Accordingly, *Nguyen* and *Robbins*, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 1. Accordingly, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness and should withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a).

Independent claim 5, while of different scope than claim 1, distinguishes over *Nguyen* and *Robbins* for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 3, 4, and 7-10 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 5. Accordingly, the Examiner should withdraw the rejection of claims 3, 4, and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) at least due to their dependence.

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1, 3-5, and 7-10 in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims, as amended, are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 2, 2007

By: 

Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921